SC 350-291



# United States Patent and Trademark Office

COPY am

United States department of Commerce Ligital States future and Trademark Office Address Colamissioner for Patents P.O. Bus 4450 Alexander Verrick 22) 18-1450

DATE MARLED: 06/28/2005

APPLICATION NO.	PILINO DATE	PIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
10/003,265	12/06/2001	Daniel Joseph Wolff	550-291	4471
7590 06/28/1905		EXAMINER		
NIXON & VANDERHYE P.C.			BROWN, CHRISTOPHER J	
8th Floor 1 100 North Globe Rd.			ART UNIT	PAPER NIMBER
Arlington, VA 22201-4714			2534	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

DOCKETED

CLT/MATTER#\_

,

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
•	10/003,265	WOLFF ET AL.
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
	Christopher J. Brown	2134
- The MAILING DATE of this communication a Period for Reply	ppears on the cover sheet will	h the carrespondence address
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REF THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR sther SIX (3) MONITHS from the mailing date of this communication.  If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (47) days, a r  If NO period for reply to expectled above, the maximum sizal-tricry park  - Feiking to pepty within the east or counsel period for reply will, by six Any reply received by the Office bias than three manifus effor the ma surred patent form adjustment. See 37 CFR 1, 704(b).	V. 1.135(a). In no event, however, may a so oply within the statutory minimum of thicky od will apply and will ampine SIX (6) MiCAT Mule, cause the application to become ABI	ply be timely filed  (80) days will be considered timely.  145 from the making date of this communication.  MICONED 615 U.S.C. 5 133).
Status		
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09	June 2005.	
	his action is non-final.	
3) Since this application is in condition for allow	wance except for formal matte	ers, prosecution as to the ments is
closed in accordance with the practice unde	er Ex parte Ouayle, 1935 C.D.	. 11, 453 O.G. 213.
Disposition of Claims		
4) Claim(s) 1-36 is/are pending in the applicati		
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.	irawn from Consideration.	
6) Claim(s) <u>1-36</u> is/are rejected.		
7) Claim(s)is/are objected to.		
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and	d/or election requirement.	•
Application Papers		
9) The specification is objected to by the Exam	iner.	
10) The drawing(s) filed on O6 December 2001	is/are: a)□ accepted or b)⊠	objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to t		
Replacement drawing sheet(s) Including the con	-	
11) The cath or declaration is objected to by the	Exammer. Note the attached	Office Action of form P10-182.
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119	•	
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for fore	ign priority under 35 U.S.C. §	119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) All b) Some * c) None of:		
1. Certified copies of the priority docum		nellaction No
Certified copies of the priority docum     Copies of the certified copies of the priority docum		
application from the International But	•	1. Contract in him tagrioridi Grafic
* See the attached detailed Office action for a	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	received.
	,	
Attachment(s)		
1) X Notice of References CRed (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Palent Drawing Review (PTO-848) 3) X Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB.	Paper No(	iummary (PTO-413) s)Mail Date, nformai Pateni Application (PTO-152)
3) [X] Information Disclosure Statement(9) (PTO-1449 or PTO/Statement(9)) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 4/27/2005.	a) Other:	manner man chimingness (c. 1 a. 140)

Art Unit: 2134

Page 2

### DETAILED ACTION

#### **Drawings**

1. New corrected drawings in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in this application because the drawings are of an informal nature and are not of uniform appearance and thickness. Applicant is advised to employ the services of a competent patent draftsperson outside the Office, as the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office no longer prepares new drawings. The corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The requirement for corrected drawings will not be held in abeyance.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
- (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disolosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter partains. Patentability shall not be negotived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 3-9, 12, 13, 15-21, 24, 25, 27-33, 36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Xu US 2002/0038339 in view of Tso US 6,088,803.

Art Unit: 2134

Page 3

As per claims 1, 13, and 25 Xu teaches a proxy network device, [0111]. Xu teaches the device receives an access request issued by a client device to said file storage device, [0115]. Xu teaches use of dedicated access protocols, [0173]. Xu teaches that the file storage device processes the request [0115]. Xu teaches the ability to scan for malware, but does not explicitly teach malware scanning, [0177].

Tso teaches scanning files for malware, (Col 2 lines 26-33, 38-45).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use the malware scanning of Tso with the proxy device of Xu because scanning for viruses would enhance network security.

As per claims 3, 15, and 27, Xu teaches use of the NFS protocol, [0173].

As per claims 4, 16, and 28, Xu teaches that the proxy device shares the same ID (IP address) as the file storage device, [0115].

As per claims 5, 17, and 29, Xu teaches that the proxy is attached to a plurality of storage devices, each having a separate identifier, [0120].

As per claims 6, 18, and 30, Xu teaches that the proxy has a unique identifier compared to the storage device, [0116].

As per claims 7, 19, and 31, Tso teaches scanning for malware using algorithms, (Col 3 lines 40-53).

As per claims 8, 9, 20, 21 32, and 33, Tso teaches storing files previously accessed and scanned to shorten access times for clients, (Col 5 lines 1-13).

Art Unit: 2134

Page 4

As per claims 12, 24, and 36, Tso teaches load balancing with multiple proxies, [0178].

Claims 2, 14, and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Xu US 2002/0038339 in view of Tso US 6,088,803 in view of Edmonds US 6,230190 As per claims 2, 14, and 26 the previous Xu-Tso combination teaches use of NFS protocol (Xu [0173]). The Xu-Tso combination fails to teach SMB protocol.

Edmonds teaches that the use of NFS and SMB protocols are equivalent, (Col 4 lines 30-35). It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to use the SMB protocol of Edmonds with the network system of Xu-Tso because the extra protocol would expand the flexibility of the system.

Claims 10, 22, and 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Xu US 2002/0038339 in view of Tso US 6,088,803 in view of Cuomo US 2002/0091757.

As per claims 10, 22, and 34, the previous Xu-Tso combination teaches a proxy in a network. Xu-Tso fails to teach forwarding access attributes to a file storage access device for a validation check.

Cuomo teaches a proxy that forwards user attributes to the device the user is trying to access, wherein the device processes the authentication request, [0007].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use the proxy forwarding of Cuomo with the system of Xu-Tso because the authentication at the file storage device enhances the security of the system.

Art Unit: 2134

Page 5

Claims 11, 23, and 35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Xu US 2002/0038339 in view of Tso US 6,088,803 in view of Cuomo US 2002/0091757 in view of Chang US 6,715,082

As per claims 11, 23, and 35, the previous Xu-Tso-Cuomo system fails to teach storing the predetermined authentication attributes.

Chang teaches storing usernames in a system cache, (Col 8 table 1).

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to use the cache of Chang with the system of Xu-Tso-Cuomo because the cache allows the user to gain access more rapidly.

#### Conclusion

3. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Christopher J. Brown whose telephone number is (571)272-3833. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30-6:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gregory Morse can be reached on (571)272-3838. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2134

Page 6

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Christopher J. Brown

6/18/05

Bayld Y. Jung Brumary, Examiner

David Y. Jung Primary Examiner